

19/05/14

19<sup>th</sup> May

Inspector – questions from John Elsworth – Mr Cameron, maybe you can deal with them outside the inquiry

Inspector – info that Mr McKinnon has given. Tomorrow we are intending to have Mr Jones, the questions on Elsworth's paper and re-examination

BILL MCKINNON CROSS-EXAMINING JASON SMITH

14:04

Bm – chairman of Friends of Wood House Moor – I was chairman of the North Hyde Park neighbourhood association and am vice of A660 joint council.

Bm – when you were being cross-examined on Friday – Deborah Fahi from Whitfield said you are quite happy for NGT to run in front of primary school – in your reply to Mrs Fahi you said there were discussions with the school and the design of the route was configured in conjunction with them. You said "they've been fully involved throughout" – look at bn-11-4 – the 2 emails I handed in. from the school's head of board of governors – he says he has spoken with the head teacher and both are somewhat in the dark about this – "I don't know anything... I've asked the school sec to undertake investigation as to intention of planning authority and get bk to you when more info to hand." 2<sup>nd</sup> email suggests that the first meeting with the school was at end of March last year. Even if the NGT runs in extreme proximity you didn't inform the school about NGT and didn't consult till v. late  
Js – not the case – the school was involved and I am happy to provide dates we met school reps. The original proposals were slightly different and through discussions with the school that that configuration has been arrived at – more recently had some final tweaks. The school has been involved – the layout is partly driven by them and their needs with the car parking etc. including pedestrian crossing they asked for

Bm – how do you explain the fact they were both in the dark? If on 25 Feb last year the head of board of gov and head teacher didn't know about the scheme - who did know?

Js- as I said we'll give you the contacts we had with school reps who we met with a couple of times. I'm not sure what he's [the governors] aware of.

Inspector – you've met with them since this email - Feb and March 2013

Js – yes – as the scheme that went into the application was partly driven by comments by the school and subsequently all the fine details have been rejigged – to get more parking etc. they have been involved before and after the application went in

Bm – I will be curious to see the docs you refer to

Cameron – we will produce a note – about all the communications with St Joseph's school

Bm – this particular question is under 'consultation'

Bm – at para 7.5.4 your proof – you state that poor bus service punctuality and cancelled services were raised by members of public at various consultations – you were referring to road shows in 2009

Js – not exclusively. That was part of what was written in the statement of case

Bm – one was over several days in front of central library, another in Victoria quarter, and question in Metro's consultation form [which is in doc bm-111 in the pink folder] that asks ppl about punctuality, question 5 – was a general question about reliability of public transport for everyone in the city and beyond

Js- speak to Haskins – he is the witness as to the consultation

19/05/14

Bm – whitfield – para 6.9.3 talking about an alternative - your proof you state the route via low road and church st is one that would circumvent hunslet district centre and not integrate very well...

“likely to experience greater journey time...” – the first part about the route via low road is one that will circumvent the centre – but that route goes pass the health centre and morrisons doesn’t it  
Js – it does but doesn’t integrate as well – not right in middle of plaza centre. Goes round the edge. need to cross over road.

Bm- but can’t get into morrisons and penny hill centre from whitfield square can you, you have to walk around?

Js – that’s correct

Bm – what you said about circumvention doesn’t make any sense does it ...

Js- it would go through the edge of it rather than middle –

Bm – not really v. accessible to the penny hill centre

Js – certainly not if you went with the alternative – which is on the other side of the road – its opposite side to the penny hill centre.

Bm – but it’s some considerable distance away isn’t it (plan/drawing 36)

Js – no, I wouldn’t call it that.

Bm – quite a walk to get to morrisons – to say that the stop is at the back of morrisons...it’s close but to get in it’s quite a distance and I wouldn’t want to carry my shopping all the way

Inspector – have you done measurements before?

Js - yes around 150m to come out around the site to the stop

Bm – when were the whitfields pedestrianized

Js – I don’t know the year

Bm – why do you think it was

Js – that link was no longer needed and to improve the public realm

Bm – not to create a safe environment for the ppl living there

Js – that road was no longer needed and included the public realm?

Bm – what is changed to make it needed now

Js – not needed for general traffic just ngt – the vehicles at 6 min frequencies at low speed

Bm – you said that it doesn’t make a difference from a time pov but a punctuality pov

Js – yes compared to the alternatives. We’ve been through this before --- to uplift plaza area and also so we didn’t need the upgrades in the church road junction and potential delay to other road users.

Bm – bus stops – para 5.3.1 of your proof you state that bus stops and ngt stops are in close proximity in the city centre to provide convenient interchange. Isn’t it the case that unlike elsewhere on the route the bus stops are so frequent[ly located] it would be difficult to avoid one

Js – it is not referring exclusively to the city centre. But, yes the city centre has lots of good potential for interchange

Bm – that’s just a fortunate coincidence isn’t it

Js- it’s referring to other places as well. E.g 10.3 – goes through the whole route sector by sector looking at the physical proximity of bus stops – certainly not just about the city centre

Bm – 5.4.2 – you’ve given a table listing ngt stops and reasons for the locations –I’ve not been able to find a similar table for the ordinary bus stops – does it exist?

Js – no – ngt table was along reasons for footpaths etc...and as set out earlier the key reasons for moving bus stops were in 5.3 and 5.4 – it was around moving bus stops into laybys and downstream of ngt stops and reasons for not sharing

Bm – the ordinary bus stops are just taking the spaces left over from ngt

Js – not at all – we tried to make them link best they can in physical proximity to ngt stops

Bm - you’ve placed one ngt on leeds uni Parkinson steps and moved the existing stop away – presumably you’ve done that to capture patronage? isn’t that unfair?

19/05/14

Js – so with the outbound – for the reasons set out in my proof about buses potentially blocking the route we've moved (A-11, td24) those bus stops for that reason and moved them to a way to the south (td25) – those bus stops are within 50m of the ngt stop so if you're arguing ngt is in prime position then so are those bus stops – one is within 40m and other 60m. I think they are all together as part of a piece.

Bm - you're entitled to your opinion. It's the case though that students coming out from entrance just lower down from the steps – the first bus stop we come to is the ngt stop

Js – and the next one is 40m away and also next to a pedestrian crossing

Bm – para 6.8.1 – you state a high profile stop will be provided for each uni – I looked at td36 – I see none at the city centre campus of met uni.

Js – I said both uni, the uni of leeds and met uni – we've got a stop next to the "leslie-silver" building on td 26. On the moat on the drawing.

Bm – there's nothing by the main building that ppl consider to be leeds met uni

Js – that is certainly one of their main buildings – the leslie silver building

Bm – you've relocated some existing stops – so distance between some increased and reduced.

Js – done for the reasons because it would conflict with the ngt stop – e.g. laybys in same location if possible – also tried to locate them next to footways and side roads and also made sure they were clear in terms of visibility. As I said we've tried to relocate as many as close to ngt stops as possible.

bm – but quite often not v. successful

js – we've got 41 bus stops within 100m of ngt stops

bm – 6.9.3 – you state the penny hill centre will have a bespoke ngt stop – will it be covered from the elements?

Js – I think there is a canopy – ask mr walker

Bm – a roof? Like an existing stop

Js – yes

Bm – doors that open and shut automatically

Js – no I don't think

Bm – in what way is it bespoke?

Js – there is a standard ngt stop – set out in doc A-08K – urban design and access statement – page 35 section 2.5 sets out the three levels of stops and goes through the design etc. and on the drawings that then follow on figure 2.02 page 38 – it shows where the bespoke and high standard stops are but details with mr walker

Bm – one point – that para 2.9 – it says canopies won't be provided where this will impact heritage area/conservation area – almost all of city centre and Headingley through conservation area

Js – it doesn't say all of them just where it [the conservation areas/buildings] is unduly impacted e.g. city square

Bm – para 5.49 – page 24 of the equality impact assessment doc a-08-H-2 – "older ppl consider accessibility of interchange as important – frequently identified in surveys....should be appropriately sited – at 400m intervals to prevent passengers from having to walk too far. Older ppl prevented from walking long distances..." were you aware of this

Js – yes

Bm – but the stops are about 50% further apart

Js – the ngt system is not intended to replace the entire bus system. In addition to the bus stop infrastructure there are then additional ngt stops – so in terms of public transport offering there will be more stops available than there would otherwise be. As we have to recognise it's a Rapid Transit System (RTS), not replacing entire bus system, and on other RTS e.g. metro link Manchester/Nottingham NET/Midland Metro stops basically generally between 400-800m. average

stop spacing here on NGT is 577m – that is well within parameters for a RTS. Even in Leeds there are express services such as x84 – so not unusual to have an express stopping service. This system is not intended to replace the bus system. [Smith misquoted the X84's stopping arrangements here].

Bm – you call it a RTS – so you're happy to let infirm ppl use the old buses and not this RTS

Js – I am simply pointing out there the no. of access points to the system increases. We are well within the parameters for RTS stop spacing.

Bm – the x84 stop and ordinary one on Headingley are being combined – inbound at the dry cleaners – students are not at a convenience on one side (Northfield road/Cumberland road?) but others on Devonshire road area. Do you agree these changes don't provide integrated transport for 1180 students.

Js – td 20 – we show that one by Highfield house is moved 60m and other one north of Cumberland road is moved 90m to a bus layby. The one between Cumberland and Grovenor road is moved again into a layby about 100m to the south

Bm – do you agree this doesn't make access easier for the students

Js – depends where they are coming from. I've been through how the stops have moved there.

Bm – from students coming down Cumberland road they have a further 90m to walk

Js – yes

[Both Bm and Js completely misunderstand X84's stopping arrangements]

Bm – Bodington Hall playing fields – 5.5.5 your proof you state that it's not possible to re-provide the existing level of programme-able sports time unless artificial pitches be used... – isn't it the case that the land simply isn't available to replace that land lost

Js – we looked at King Lane – uni didn't want to pursue – we looked at other sites that uni was clear they wanted their replacement sports pitches to be. We looked at to the north – Weetwood site – we looked at whether we could use that. It's partly in the uni's ownership...we were able to rule that out on the grounds that it would have a huge retaining wall 8-9m – v. expensive. It impacted on the existing tenant as well. We looked at the Bodington site – including scrubland towards outer ring road – there are huge level differences on this site (drainage) – again in order to provide a level area we would need to provide extensively retaining structures which would be visibly intrusive. We worked with the uni to find a site. It was the view of both the uni and promoters and Sport England that actually because of the lack of available space – we would need to use artificial pitches to get the same intensity of use. We are having to use existing pitches (e.g. Lawnswood) which are not used well this minute – but to bring across that use we would need to use artificial lawn pitches. We've gone through in huge detail with the activity – looked at their programme/their requirements and v. clear we would need it for this area.

Bm – you mentioned the King Lane site (para 6.3.6) – explain why the uni has abandoned advanced plans to develop sports pitches at King Lane site (Conwell Farm) – wouldn't it always have required the additional road trips. You've stated that the Conwell Farm proposal would have been more expensive but why was this a concern if Metro was reimbursing the uni for the costs?

Js – they didn't want to pursue the King Lane site as the original reasons to pursue it was that the cemetery (next to the Lawnswood sports field) – the drive was that the cemetery would be extended so uni was looking at alternative sites for some of their sports fields. But the cemetery extension is no longer pursued so that removes one of the prime needs to move up to King Lane. The uni, were clear that they didn't want disjointed facilities whereby they had to bus up students to the north.

Bm – you did pursue those other plans over many years. You have stated that the Conwell Farm was more expensive – does that message mean something. Who is it so important to that it's expensive? It shouldn't matter to the uni – but it does matter to Metro (the costs)? Why did you put this in your proof? It's as if Metro had an input in the decision, isn't it?

19/05/14

Js – it's public money being used on this scheme – therefore should find the most cost effective alternative – if they can save the public money then that should be noted and a good reason

Bm – 6.6.2 – you state there has been extensive discussion on the playing field impacts – have the students expressed what they want

Js – I met with the student union ppl – we have names of ppl we met – we also talked to student representatives who run part of the sites.

Bm – we heard earlier that the students were in favour but actual fact it was only 90 students in a student union vote who voted in favour. What degree of involvement has there been with the students? You said there's been extensive consultation – we await your paperwork on st joseph's school – you said the same thing about that

Js – I said that student reps were present at consultation meetings and they consulted more widely.

Bm – could you let us have details

Js – yes

Bm – hazards. Para 5.8.15 – you've stated for works inside affecting the hazard zone they're would be a safe method of work – a public awareness campaign and training for local services working “ – are you aware HK rejected possibility of making a trolleybus because of problems it would cause with fire crews

Js – we've gone through and learned lessons and followed best practice from other systems in the UK and also experience with uK emergency services. Fire crew – same procedure in Nottingham. The bits attached to buildings – the live parts not being in contact with buildings or poles – if there is a need to be within the hazard zone certainly emergency services will have direct contact with the control centre and it [the overhead cables] could be de-energized immediately if need be. This system has worked well with tram systems without problems.

Bm – you've looked at uk cities and adopting best practice from them. But trolleybus uses twice as many cables as trams. And also there is the problem of overhead cables getting in the way of fire crews.

Js – not any more than tram systems. There are twin wires – in order to support that there may be additional or reconfigured catenary systems. Doesn't mean there will be double as many wires

Bm – approximately though

Js – no

Bm – if trolley uses two wires – on park row there would be four overhead cables

Js – no as in addition to that there would be contact wire systems – catenary system which will connect everything. Those wouldn't be doubled.

Bm – you are splitting hairs. You know what I mean that there will be twice the obstruction to the fire crew [Js had overstepped the mark in his obtuseness.]

Js – i don't think the fire crew would be trying to get into the middle of the road above the live wires and if they did they have contact to de-energize the cables from the central hub.

Bm – I'm talking about trying to put their ladders up etc.

Js – I don't think so – those contact wires are in close proximity to each other. I do accept there are two contact wires but they are in close proximity and wouldn't auto mean there would be further obstructions. You also don't have double no. of catenary support wires.

Bm- how long to take to switch off power in event of a fire?

Js – immediately upon a request by the emergency services it would be shut down. I've checked with Nottingham and they're not aware of any issues that have arisen there, and I'm not aware of issues in any other cities

Bm – substations – para 5.9.4 – you state the most sensitive locations have been avoided. They've all been placed on open space have they?

19/05/14

Js – I don't say that on para 5.9.4 – I say it has been considered within the environmental context and avoided where practical. No – I don't think they've been placed by open space – the red lion pub substation – in a car park.

Bm – any other examples?

Js – we've got one in the park and ride where a lot of potential to screen it off with planting etc. and tried to use locations whereby they'll be less visible e.g. otley – existing clearing of trees. It's trying to look at locations where they will be less prominent. There is one in the bodington park and ride which is built into the stair and ramp area... screened from sight.

Bm – operational problems – para 5.10.1 – you state that the trolleys will be fitted with batteries to enable them to de-wire. To do that the overhead cable would have to be positioned directly above and I'm wondering how long it would take to reconnect to the wires

Js – that's more in connection with moving around road works or obstacles – the vehicles can come off the route. in terms of overtaking another trolley that is not part of the operational scenario as the route is segregated majority or a lot of priority so should be free –running. Actually it shouldn't need to do it for the reason of overtaking other cars only if there is an immovable obstacle. Its' not needed for normal operation but re-wiring can be done automatically by the driver but could take 20-30 seconds.

Bm – not being able to overtake is a disadvantage that can lead to bunching?

Js – headway is 6 min so there should be no need to overtake – we've tried to remove any chance by creating new lanes and improved traffic management

Bm – para 10.5.2 – you state ngt will comply with speed limit – trolleys have to take corners more slowly to reduce de-wiring

Js – in past years yes, but the trolley poles themselves those are much stiffer and lighter weight so greatly reducing chance of trolley de-wiring at a curve/corner. In line with the design we've tried to get rid of really tight turns where we can. Clearly there are still some trolleybuses will have to slow down for. But the tech has moved on.

Bm - Para 5.10.3 – warning bell/acoustic device will be fitted – if you were elderly or night shift worker on whitfields would you be pleased having a t/bus ringing its bell near where you live

Js – only does it when there is an obstruction that needs to be warned.

Bm – when mr forin cross-examined you – he put to you the possibility that a child could run out from a garden on whitfield way – the trolley driver wouldn't know to ring the bell in advance – the child would be quick...

Js – I note that unlike a conventional road (higher speed and often cars parked at side with ppl running between them – sight lines are much better and include the footway. The vehicle running along at no more than 15 miles an hour. I know that Leeds city council suggested lower speed of 10 miles but we have gone bk with mitigation measures – WE WILL BE DISCUSSING WITH LCC THE LOWER 10mpg LIMIT GOING FORWARDS if Leeds city council ultimately says that 10 miles is one to go for then that is the one we'll go for. [Clearly a change in tune from when Greg brought this up on Friday]

Bm – there are fences bordering whitfield way and v. small children. You are proposing a bell because trolleybuses are dangerous

Js – any vehicles can pose danger

Bm –but more so as other vehicles don't ring bells

Js - yes in Manchester the tram does. I have seen people standing in the way at the pedestrianized section at Picc Gdns, driver rings bell and they move out of the way. Works well [Apart from the

19/05/14

number of people that have bit hit by trams at this exact location, which Smith obviously failed to mention]

Bm – if it was this easy to reduce hazard it wouldn't be nicknamed 'silent death'

Js – that was many decades ago

Bm – but they had bells then

Js – but things moved on in terms of braking and warnings

Bm – but that hasn't made a difference in America

Js – but as an examples, America is a different regulatory regime and can't be compared.

Bm – is it alright if we talk about that a bit later.

Bm – still on operational problems – ive heard occupants of buildings with attachment of the cables experience a whine as the bus goes pass

Js – max Forni deals with it

Bm – have business users and owners of property which cable will be attached been made aware of these potential issues

Js – need to address mr haskins as to consultations – info papers were given out

BREAK

[15:30]

Cameron: you asked me about mr elsworth questions – we will put in a written response to them

Bm – move on to headingley hill para 5.13.1 – you stated that you propose to create a new area of biodiversity – will it have bats/bird of prey and grazing horses as present

Js – speak to mr purselove for ecology

Bm – drawing 19 of df 7 – a-11 – shows a660 widened by a metre on both sides of Buckingham road. It is already v. steep up to junction and I can't find docs on the road works that will be necessary for this?

Js – yes there are some – the red and white dashed line is a retaining structure – you can see the length of these structures required for the slope. The retaining walls are shown there on the plan. Road will be regarded a bit

Bm – landscape drawing m4931-118, td18 core doc a-12 – there is a road there shows its running in a northerly direction and its next to the telephone exchange and its running through trees (marked on the drawing) – I wondered what is the significance of the road running through the trees, an error?

Js – do you mean the access track to headingley castle

Bm – could be that

Js – that is their access track.

Bm – but the trees shown in the road itself?... I suppose we could ask this to the landscaping witness.

Bm – are you aware of the student accommodation at the end of northfield/Cumberland road and there is over a 1000 students living there?

Js – yes

Bm – and Devonshire hall in particular generates a lot of traffic

19/05/14

Js - yes

Bm – are you aware both roads (north hill/field and Cumberland road) are difficult to access as it is

Js – yes

Bm – they are cul de sacs

Bm – monument moor – drawing td22-23 of a-11 – gives the name “hyde park” to the part of the park on the south side of woodhouse moor.

Js –where is this?

Bm - you're aware aren't you that the park on both sides of the road is called woodhouse moor – do you know that hyde park is a residential area to the north?

Js – yes

Bm – para 6.7.8 you state ‘an alternative scheme for ngt remaining on a widened woodhouse lane has previously been considered but rejected for the following reasons...’ – para 6.7.11 one reason was that this option requires removal of all the trees on the eastern grass verge and replacement planting would be set back and not on same line as the existing tree...’ question 22 of metro’s FAQ which is doc bm-104 in the pink folder I gave you – asked ‘will ngt be running across woodhouse moor’ and the reply was that there were two options – woodhouse moor or a660 sections. This option was shown as option 12 on bm 107 (df 6) – you approved this drawing didn't you?

Js – yes

Bm – have you forgotten about this option to leave the moor intact when you wrote para 6.7.8-11

Js – not at all. This is a drawing from four years ago – it was done before the project was put on hold for 2 years reflecting what was happening at that time. It does not represent the final position of the design for the on street option. This is a complete superseded drawing

Bm – but options I'm referring to here that was referred to be ngt's FAQ –

Js – it may be helpful if you want to look at this drawing and take you through (opt12-006) what actually changed?

Bm – it's ok. I have questions that will draw out what you're suggesting. But did you know the friends of woodhouse moor took reps to ask the council to adopt the option which would have left woodhouse moor intact?

Js – I was aware

Bm – it states that formally there were 2 options – you've said that the options that were consulted on were those that dated back 4 years – how old are the options in your proof

Js – no they're 2013 –

Bm – they weren't consulted on

Js – they weren't – that was a scheme that went to plans panel and went to project board.

Bm – you make a distinction between consultation and engagement – where engagement is where ppl are told what would happen

Js – speak to haskins

Bm – I would be interested to see evidence that there were two evidence presented to the plans panel – if you could supply that

Js – it will be in the briefing note – I'm not sure which you went to

Bm – 25<sup>th</sup> june

Js – I'm not sure that was the relevant one

Cameron – we've got the presentation to the plans panel in the docs

Bm – para 6.7.9 you give the following as reason for rejecting that option – ‘junction is not operationally efficient and traffic use may impede ngt progress through the junction...’ option 12 of df6 shows the alternative included closure of the right turn onto clarendon road. This alternative



19/05/14

which you haven't mentioned in your proof would have solved the traffic problems impeding ngt's progress

Js – it may be helpful I actually go through the drawings – it was ruled out early on in the process

Bm – it was consulted on in 2012

Js – I said that was a different option – still an on street option but different. Don't confuse this one from 2010 with consultation held in 2013. Bm 107 is the drawing which was made in 2010 – if we look at the junction with clarendon road – you'll see one ngt lane (orange) heading southbound into city and one general traffic lane coming into the junction. When we looked at this with leeds city council and UTC it became apparent that prohibiting right turn was a major issue for the council as there is a more orbital movement that comes through from clarendon road that goes through rampart road. It's coming through the city centre/park lane/park road etc. heading towards kirkstall road (orbital movements between Kirkstall Road and Meanwood Road) – there is a big movement of traffic. Prohibiting that right turn compromises that orbital flow and it forces more traffic to do the right turn at hyde park junction which is more acute. It placed more traffic around the park – around hyde park road. It created an environmental disbenefit with more traffic and noise around the park. The reasons of that orbital movement and displacing that right turn – leeds city council and metro determined we needed to have a right turn at clarendon so – that was a major change that was then required. Another one was that on this drawing there is no right turn from woodhouse lane northbound into rampart road – leeds UTC wanted a right turn in to cater for the orbital movement. In doing so – when we widened the bus lane to 4.2m it meant there wasn't enough space to put in a right turn to rampart road – which required further widening taking out some trees in the area. Essentially you needed a right turn at clarendon and rampart road – the main consequence of putting that in at clarendon road is that we would have had to shorten the bus lane to about 100m further back and a single lane alongside the bus lane that then widened into two and a head lane and right turn lane at the front. That meant the ngt stop would be 100m off from the junction and be more remote (from the uni).

The drawing here that we've got bm 107 was superseded by the requirements (right turns) and doesn't have the widths for the bus lanes (4.2m) and doesn't do the job that we needed it to do. It developed in that way – but we did still end up with an on street option with those new things on – which would need widening there at rampart road and the right turns... (cycle feeder lanes etc.) – and what that does is that it takes out the trees. If you don't have ngt coming off onto the moor you need to have it coming through on the highway – so you need extra lanes. You've widened it and meant that it would have took out trees.

We did end up with two options both perfectly feasible with different pros and cons – presented both to plans panel and it was them who then decided on the through the moor option.

Bm – you said 'if you close the access to clarendon to right turning traffic you'd have more traffic on hyde park road. It's a large road isn't it – you're closing many other turns along the route – why you drew the line on clarendon road – yes more traffic going around the park but your proposal is a ngt going across the park

Js – hyde park lane got parking all down one side so pretty narrow going past that parking – its not suitable for having that orbital traffic movement on it and also the additional noise impact should be avoided. The traffic itself would have to go through a more convoluted route than now.

Bm – you're taking out parking elsewhere

Js – we are trying to minimise parking reductions

Bm – 6.7.10 – additional reasons for running it across the moor. The inbound ngt stop is required to be located 100m north – to provide adequate storing space for the vehicles.... Etc. you state the inbound ngt stop is 100m north of clarendon road junction. But isn't running through the moor – create more storage space for running vehicles...

19/05/14

Js – there is a heavy demand for the right turn – certain no. of vehicles turn right so we have to make sure we have adequate storage for those right turners and we don't block it for other traffic going through the junction straight on. In order not to do that we've had to cut back that bus lane so we know the right turners can be stored. All of that means the ngt stop is about 100m away from the junction. There was a concern as to the resilience to future right turner growth.

Bm – isn't it also the reason that by sticking traffic on woodhouse moor you make it easier for the trolleybus to pass narrower stretches on the other side of the junction

js – for the on street option – provided we didn't have right turners blocking – ngt should be able to get through a junction in a single cycle. For the off street option that can also go through in one cycle.

Bm – I'm gathering the right turners are a major issue

Js – yes

Bm – why aren't you simply demolishing the buildings on the left side of the road as you pass through the junctions e.g. hoslowth buildings causing road to be narrow (audible shock from audience)

Js – because it would have impact on those businesses and no compelling reason to demolish however many buildings

Bm – I'm not saying you should do that – but would cost less than the land in moor

Js – but it is land operated by businesses

Bm- but at woodhouse moor its 'free' land

Js – we considered visual impact on taking the moor space – mr walker done it.

Bm – I was thinking the financial impact on the scheme for demolishing those buildings

Js – I've not looked into the cost of that

Bm- you've stated the inbound ngt stop is to be located 100m north of the junction – option 12 of the drawing 6 – isn't it the case that the ngt stop is located nearer than the clarendon road junction. Does the location of pushing back the ngt stop 100m reflect the potential for congestion in this right turn area?

Js – it could have been moved closer. It's the right turn issue that I went through to make sure the junction is clear.

Bm – the distance in a straightline from rampart to clarendon junction is less along the monument moor diversion

Js – yes some metres less

Bm – you're colleague on plans panel on 25<sup>th</sup> june said that in order to maintain run times the trolley has to run across the moor

J s- in terms of the capacity and future resilience of the junction

Bm – didn't you say being on the moor also gives us resilience to traffic growth – so punctuality and reliability maintained in the future. There is an additional factor of traffic growth now and in the future

Js – yes

Bm – para 1.10 – you stated that your team sought improved provision for other highway users. Since cars and buses held at a traffic trap – would you agree this doesn't improve position for other highway users.

Js – I would disagree – we've got feed lanes for cyclists, ped crossings, we've got bus...

Bm – I'm talking being held in the traffic stack

Js – in terms of the functioning of the junction that would be GR.

19/05/14

[16:14]

Bm – you’ve not dealt with modal shift in your proof yet in the plans panel you said the moor route gave you better resilience to traffic growth – were you instructed to future proof this scheme against future traffic growth

Js – we do need to consider it [Somewhere here Smith also said “The modal shift will always be quite small in relation to radial and orbital traffic levels (owtte)]

Bm – you said that you were ‘future-proofing’ this scheme

J s- no I said there was concern as to the growth of the right turners...

Bm – you’ve said that it gives more resilience to traffic growth but there has been a downturn in traffic in recent years

J s- but there was a downturn etc...we can’t expect that to continue forever – speak to mr GR

Bm – if modal shift took place there would be no worries of traffic growth

Js – no as it will always be proportional to the traffic going into Leeds

Bm – you’ve stated the more remote location of ngt stop on this preferred route provided good opportunities for a plaza and urban realm uplift. Take a look at bm 105 photo – could you confirm that this is the precise location of the woodhouse ngt inbound stop.

Js – its in the area –

Bm – it is the location. Can you tell me how the ngt stop uplifts that realm you’re looking at

Js – urban design drawing 123- corresponds to td23. I note there are two trees at risk (solid orange circle) – there are no trees in the area that are being removed but some trees in that area (6 ish) are to be retained. From that I would infer that the ngt stop is beyond those trees – and the line actually avoids those trees. But mr walker will provide more details. The grass is used for parking quite regularly... also increasing a wild flower mix to increase biodiversity

Bm - you’ll find there are trees missing from that map

Js – well mr walker will tell you in detail

Bm – move on to the area from university to cookridge street para 5.14.30 – you state that the highway between st marks road and portland way will be reconfigured to provide a high quality link to city centre and para 6.8.4 you state that widened footways and low height curbs will be provided on woodhouse lane so entire highway will be less formally marked encouraging peds. – there were plans to put in bridge the connect the uni

J s- yes

Bm – isn’ t it that creating a 6 lane highway, this would isolate the university centre

J s- no, the opposite – the traffic is diverted – so between university and city centre – all the through traffic is going by the walk and eastern edge of woodhouse lane – that is taken away. The bit that woodhouse lane passes through met uni – all of that has no through traffic only public transport and limited access southbound to Blenheim lane – we have created a more campus feel allowing us to widen footways and create a shared space environment – more attractive. It help and connects the uni campuses to the city centre.

Bm – you’re focussing on that area (Woodhouse Lane between Portland Way and uni) but I’m focussing on area just to the south (south of Portland Way). That is in fact the 6 lanes of traffic there [segregating the campus from the city centre] – it’s actually quite pleasant at the moment. The students will have to pass through that area.

J s- you’ve got an existing highway which has moved over and alongside that you’ve then got ngt – that is part of the shared space env predominately ped and cyclists – vehicle every 6 minutes. You can’t say that that is another two lanes – that is a ped dominated area and that is the purpose for doing it.

19/05/14

Bm – did you the uni ask for the traffic to be excluded in front of parkinsons steps

Js – no – but we have had discussions as to how traffic will go through the steps area...partly also from a rethink following 2012 – we came up with a concept ourselves and discussed with the uni – their concerns included the fact we wanted to stop the parking on Benton street ... they had issues around that but they were supportive of the proposals and agreed on fenton and lodge street – that their traffic would no longer go around it to increase the feel of the shared space.

Bm – so the uni then was quite happy with the scheme as it was before you came forward with this innovation

Js – well there were issues with the service of the parkinsons steps

Bm – you came up with this alternative to get around those issues

Js – no that came around a much wider thinking of the whole area but did solve the issue of awkward access to parkinsons step

Bm – you said this area will have a ped feel – will the bell be ringing as they pass through the area

Js – unlike whitfield which is existing ped area – this area is a highway with a lot of traffic on it of which we will then reduce the traffic on it quite a lot. It's not in the same context...we will have curbs and clearly demarcated carriageway and a speed restricted road with clear safe space for peds on either side.

Bm – what about when its foggy

J s- it will proceed at a safe speed – as it is the case on that road as it is today

Bm – so trolley won't be ringing the bell

Js – depends if there is a hazard

Inspector – do you agree that it isn't a ped area?

Js – we've got the curbs out – we call it a ped dominated area – much less traffic. In terms of the shared space there are different levels of segregation and this road has public transport vehicles on it and access traffic to the Blenheim properties as well.

Bm – safety – you're proposing running trolleys through this ped dom area – it will be packed with students

J s- yes

Bm – they cross the road all the time at the moment so presumably they will be in the road area even more so when ngt comes in

Js – there are widened footways to accommodate them

Bm – do you know how many students wear earphones/mobiles etc

Js – pointed out by university so they pressed for lower speed limit in the area.

Bm – are they going to get it

Js – yes we've set it up to 20 miles an hour

Bm – not 10 miles

J s- in respect of the designer response – that was in connection with whitfield where it was already fully pedestrianized. In these specific areas it is up to 20 there could be further discussions to reduce it. [Smith states it could be up to 20 but is likely to be less than this – another significant change of tune. I doubt that there has been a runtime assessment for trolleybuses travelling at less than 20mph].

Bm – do you agree that talking on mobile etc could make person more likely to step in front of trolley

Js – more likely to step in front of any vehicles

Bm – but trolley is quieter ...

Bm – road safety – do you know what rule 163 of highway code requires

Js – not to hand

19/05/14

Bm – it states to give vulnerable road users as much space as a car – car 2m wide...you won't be able to provide cyclists with that clearance as stated in highway code

Js – for bus lanes we've put clearances in accordance with doc g-4-74 sec 6.2.2 –

Bm – we're not going to have the clearance required by highway code

Js – we are following national guidance for clearance for cyclists (g-4-74)

Cameron – rule 163 says that this is only to do with overtaking... we'll follow it up in the re-examination (but you should put the doc in front of him when you ask the question)

Bm – para 7.2.11 of your proof – you state here that cyclists will share an additional 1.3km of footway with pedestrians and this improves overall cyclists facilities and safety but it does nothing for ped facilities and safety doe sit

Js – peds are dealt with in the next section. There are shared used footpaths e.g. lawnswood school – there is a dual network depending on how confident you are to assist.

Bm – so shared space – that is the same concept as naked streets.

J s- there are different levels of shared space – there are some where there are just ngt or at uni there is public transport and other traffic. The ngt equality access group -the team has been through what is appropriate for each location e.g. surface colours/delineators – its not a one size fits all.

Bm – so all the ped areas that trolley will run through will become shared space. The concept behind shared space is that by removing the traditional aids for road safety – highway users becomes more cautious.

Js – yes

Bm – signs/barriers/traffic lights/ can be removed to encourage ppl to feel a little at risk so they become more careful

Js – depending on the context.

Bm – 7.3. 13 – you state that the trolley will be fitted with a bell – flies in the face of the shared space concept as ppl start relying on the bell they will become accustomed to using it

J s- not it's pretty standard – you wouldn't sit there and do nothing if someone is in the way. The driver will sound his horn to move ppl out of the way.

Bm – the uni area – that will be shared space?

Js – yes but different kind to whitfield

Bm – para 7.8.1 – you state ngt proposals will provide a standard modern trolleybus system not including untried features and tech. so there is nothing distinctive about this trolleybuses distinguishing them from others in operation

J s- well they will be brand new unlike others around the world – [BUT THEY WON'T BE BRAND NEW WHEN THEY'RE 12 YEARS OLD – NGT ASSUMES REPLACEMENT AFTER 12 YEARS]

Bm – aside from age they are expected to have the pros and cons of trollelybuses in general

Js – I'm not sure what your question is

Bm – these will have the same disadvantages that all trolleys have

Js – it's a modern trolleybus with features of modern trolleys [AGAIN, WONT'T BE BRAND NEW WHEN THEY'RE 12 YEARS OLD]

Bm – just want to know if these will be standard ones like in Europe/American – not different in any way

J s- they would need to conform with uk specifications

Bm – are there uk regs?

Js – for all buses that also cover trolleys –e.g. construction and use regulations 2013

Bm – are there regs specifically for trolleys

J s- they include for all trolley bus vehicles...

Bm – there were trolley regs – have those been rescinded?

Js – they are part of the construction and use regs for any bus

Inspector – are there any regs specifically just relate to trolleybuses

Js – no – they are part of other regs.

[QUESTION HERE IS WHETHER IT IS LIKELY THE DFT WOULD HAVE TO COME UP WITH ADDITIONAL REGS TO ACCOMDATE TROLLEYBUSES, BUT SMITH AVOIDED THE QUESTION]

Bm – para 5.3.1 of health impact assessment core a-08-H-3 – page 30 – that states that overall the intro of trolleys are not considered to have a sig impact on road safety on communities in Leeds. Para 5.3 of my proof (the table) – I reproduce figures from us transit database – trolley twice as likely as motorbus to hit a vehicle and 3 and half times to hit a person. Your rebuttal at 2.5 to my evidence (RBB-1-Obj-1632) – “this data does not provide a like for like comparison as it simply aggregates total data based on miles travelled – trolleys generally operate in city centres whilst other buses operate in areas which in context have lower collision rates... Therefore when considering collision rates the operating context should be taken into account...” - in my appendices to my proof there was an abbreviated spread sheet taken from the American spreadsheet – unfortunately in the paper work I didn’t include those read me notes in the spread sheet but I’ve included it in doc Bm-112 (the pink folder). So when mr smith wrote his rebuttal he hasn’t read those read me notes.

It says there about how these figures are produced under the heading ‘who reports’ – it says ‘all transit properties are recipients of urbanised areas’ you have the question ‘what is an urbanised area’ – defined for us by the us census bureau (also in the pink folder) ‘comprises one or more places (central place) and adjacent densely settled surrounding territory – together have a min of 50,000 persons’. That is a big enough area to operate a trolley service?

Js - not in this country

Bm – what about lands croner in Norway with 30,000 inhabitant

Js – not in this countr

Bm – but there is not any here

Js – in terms of rapid transit, I think you’ll find rapid transit in larger cities. [Smith’s most patronising comment to date – and of course, there are plenty of rapid transit systems which are not in major cities – e.g Cambs guided busway and S Hants Eclipse] . But in terms of RTS that is not enough ppl. There is a huge difference between an area with 50k and a major city with several hundred thousand ppl. It could represent a town rather than a city. Whilst you have defined this I still think this allows for a great variation in terms of urban density. The orders of scale of the size (peds/vehicles/hazards) area in a completely different concept. Also America has a different regulatory regime than UK.

Bm – para 2.6 of your rebuttal you stated the ‘data quoted by bm related to the us and present a diff reg road safety environment’ – we’ve established that there may and may not be uk trolleybus regulations. Have you read the US trolleybus regulations or any?

Js – I’ve read the UK ones relevant to this scheme

Bm – [you haven’t read the US ones] yet you know the two are different?

Js – because the uk ones are specific to the UK – obtaining type licence and operator license

Bm – but you haven’t read the USA regulations

Js – nor anywhere else

Bm – you heard mr forin saying that speed limits in America less than here

J s- yes

Bm – mf forin quoted figures from national safety first association showing in 1930s trolleys more dangerous. You said they were not relevant any more – are trolleys quieter than now

Js –in 1930s there is more infrastructure now– we’ve got specifications around cycle lane widths etc. etc. none of which were there in 1930s

Bm – but also another thing is the amount of traffic we have now – much more.

Js – yes

19/05/14

Bm – para 7.8.4 of your proof – you refer to concerns about no. of existing collisions on the route – you indicate this is dealt with in transport assessment doc b-9 – para 5.32 of my proof page 26 I refer to code 227 accidents in seattle. These are those that occur when a bus pulls out. Although trolleys made up only 12% of the bus fleet they were responsible of 27% of the accidents. Were you aware of this?

Js – not before your proof

Bm – para 7.8.9 of your proof you state that a road safety audit of the ngt proposal was undertaken by leeds city council in july 2013. Did it consider that trolleys have a reputation for being dangerous and why?

Js – I’m not part of the team that undertook it – judging by the response that came back under 2.1 suggesting a lower speed in shared space it would appear so

Bm – did they make specific reference to the fact that they are inherently dangerous

Js – well I don’t believe they are...

Inspector – let’s look at the doc – designer’s response (but not actual audit...) – I’ve gathered you were responsible for the designer’s response so you would have had to look at the road safety audit to respond. From your recollection you can’t think that that’s in the report?

Js – all their responses are in the issues raised. They are aware it’s a trolley bus and the noise it makes and the issues ...

Inspector – but when you signed off the response to the audit – did you look at all the leeds safety audit or...

Js – yes I looked at the whole thing

Inspector – did you know if that was the case or not

Js – they didn’t refer to it as an ‘inherently dangerous’ vehicle – did not use those words

[17:00]

Bm – did it consider the fact that articulated buses had a rep for being dangerous

Js – they were fully aware it was articulated and taken it into account in their audit – I think its slightly beyond the audit. They are fully aware it’s a articulated trolley bus. I did check with the LCC accident studies team directly (mark callihan) as far as he’s aware the road safety team has never had cause to investigate the articulated bus road safety – they get accident stats per year - its not revealed any anomalies. Never lead them to look at or question the safety of the vehicles. In terms of metro. Again I went to them to double check this issue and they are not aware of any issues for articulated vehicles – there is new articulated vehicle run by First [ftrs on 72] and if there were any issues they would have recommended changes on that route but they didn’t.

Bm – the road safety audit - does it include figures for articulated and non-articulated buses...

Js – they look at the design and respond to it

[17:03]

Bm – if I just clarify – if I were to look at the road safety audit would it show the number of accidents articulated and non-articulated vehicles

Js – I am not aware of that

Bm – so you are saying when ppl aren’t aware of issues they are simply not looking. If you are looking at stats not showing articulated vehicles ...

Js – they are – those articulated vehicles are in the stats for general bus safety. I must stress that this is LCC’s audit

Bm – but you are relying on it. It doesn’t concern you that the road safety audit doesn’t give figures for articulated vehicles

Js – its their audit from their team and you must speak to them – its completely independent.

19/05/14

Bm – para 7.8.11 – you state there that ‘implementation of a right turn ban on hyde park junction will also result in a reduction in collisions but by diverting large volumes of traffics onto smaller road you’d increase the risk of accidents?

Js – no we are getting rid of the conflicting movements – part of the Q turn – we are getting rid of them and improving road safety

Bm – perhaps for vehicles but what about peds

Js – we include crossing facilities and widened lanes for cyclists at the junction

END OF DAY – adjourned until 10am 20<sup>th</sup> May.